

right to fly as high as his strength and ability will take him. . . . But we can not have such reform while our tax policy is engineered by people who view the tax as a means of achieving changes in our social structure. . . .

Have we the courage and the will to face up to the immorality and discrimination of the progressive tax, and demand a return to traditional proportionate taxation? . . . Today in our country the tax collector's share is 37 cents of every dollar earned. Freedom has never been so fragile, so close to slipping from our grasp.

Are you willing to spend time studying the issues, making yourself aware, and then conveying that information to family and friends? Will you resist the temptation to get a government handout for your community? Realize that the doctor's fight against socialized medicine is your fight. We can't socialize the doctors without socializing the patients. Recognize that government invasion of public power is eventually an assault upon your own business. If some among you fear taking a stand because you are afraid of reprisals from customers, clients, or even government, recognize that you are just feeding the crocodile hoping he'll eat you last.

If all of this seems like a great deal of trouble, think what's at stake. We are faced with the most evil enemy mankind has known in his long climb from the swamp to the stars. There can be no security anywhere in the free world if there is no fiscal and economic stability within the United States. Those who ask us to trade our freedom for the soup kitchen of the welfare state are architects of a policy of accommodation.

They say the world has become too complex for simple answers. They are wrong. There are no easy answers, but there are simple answers. We must have the courage to do what we know is morally right. Winston Churchill said that "the destiny of man is not measured by material computation. When great forces are on the move in the world, we learn we are spirits-not animals." And he said, "There is something going on in time and space, and beyond time and space, which, whether we like it or not, spells duty."

You and I have a rendezvous with destiny. We will preserve for our children this, the last best hope of man on earth, or we will sentence them to take the first step into a thousand years of darkness. If we fail, at least let our children and our children's children say of us we justified our brief moment here. We did all that could be done.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I would like to read just the closing two paragraphs of Ronald Reagan's speech in 1964 on behalf of Barry Goldwater, a speech that obviously did not turn the tide in that election but a speech that started his political career, a speech that inspired me to become involved in the political process. He concluded that speech, the speech in 1964 with these words:

They say the world has become too complex for simple answers. They are wrong. There are no easy answers, but there are simple answers. We must have the courage to do what we know is morally right.

You and I have a rendezvous with destiny. We will preserve for our children this, the last best hope on Earth, or we will sentence them to take the first step into a thousand years of darkness. If we fail, at least let our children and our children's children say of us we justified our brief moment here. We did all that could be done.

I cannot say it as Ronald Reagan said it, but his words still have the power of

great meaning, and what an inspiration it was to a Nation. And so when he became President of the United States, this great communicator and great optimist infused in us again the feeling that America can be and is a great Nation.

With the Reagan tax cuts, the economic recovery that it spawned, with his repair of our neglected defenses, with his courageous and bold stand to say the words that everybody criticized him for when he called communism, "The Evil Empire," as a result of that and his willingness to stand at the Berlin wall and say to Mr. Gorbachev, "Tear this wall down," it sewed the seeds for what became the collapse of the old Soviet Union and most of communism in the world.

And then perhaps no incident I think reflects the greatness of this man and his impact upon us and how he buoyed us as a people: Republicans, Democrats, and Independents, all Americans how he raised our spirits, inspired us and inspired a Nation than when on January 28, 1986, the space shuttle Challenger exploded just after takeoff, disintegrating into a ball of flame before a world television audience. The disaster understandably stunned America. Never before had the dangers of space exploration been brought home as graphically and as visibly as they were that day. The intensive prelaunch media attention had caused the world to know these seven crew members as we knew few other astronauts. We knew them with an unusual intimacy, and now they were gone. The Nation was staggered.

Then Ronald Reagan took to the airwaves. The President of the United States delivered a 5-minute speech, and he concluded his 5-minute speech by quoting the words written by a Royal Air Force pilot shortly before his death in the battle of Britain, those words that we will remember:

For I have slipped the surly bonds of Earth and touched the face of God.

President Reagan's short speech of 5 minutes, concluding with those words, unified and uplifted and encouraged a heartbroken America.

Tip O'Neill, who was Reagan's political adversary, tough political adversary, with whom he had many fierce arguments and disagreements, later that very day described the moment in which Reagan made that inspiring speech to America. He said, and I quote Tip O'Neill, "Reagan at his best." It was a trying day for all Americans and Ronald Reagan spoke to our highest ideals.

May I say, Tip O'Neill said it right because Ronald Reagan always spoke to our highest ideals. This is a very small tribute but a very fitting and appropriate tribute that we name this airport after one of our greatest Presidents and one of our greatest living Americans, Ronald Reagan.

I thank Senator COVERDELL for his leadership and his willingness to take on this project, and I yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. The Senator from Arkansas was here yesterday and gave a very inspiring commentary on his legislation to improve American education, but he has matched yesterday. Those were remarkable words, and the personal feeling in connection with the former President is obvious. I watched the same speech and remember just being stunned by it. I didn't really know that much about him, but I remember turning to my mother and saying, "You ought to have heard that speech." Anybody who heard it I think was moved by it. But I really do believe the Senator has captured his optimism, and I commend the Senator for it.

Mr. President, we have been joined by my good colleague from Nevada, who has other matters to talk about. I am going to yield the floor so that he might proceed with his piece of business.

Mr. BRYAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BRYAN. I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business for a period of time not to exceed 8 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRYAN. Let me preface my comments by thanking the senior Senator from Georgia. I am delighted to have a chance to be down here today to talk on an issue. And his willingness to accommodate me is something I appreciate very much.

NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY ACT

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, in the Chamber this week and I am sure in the next week a number of my colleagues will be talking about a January 31, 1998, deadline under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. And as I am sure my colleagues will know, there has been a recent flurry of newspaper ads and radio commercials indicating that was the deadline under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act for high-level nuclear waste to be accepted by the Department of Energy. I want to put those comments and those ads in some perspective so that no one should be misled by the assertions of the nuclear utility industry.

The genesis of our current policy with respect to disposal of high-level waste traces its origins to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982. It is true that in that piece of legislation it was contemplated the Department of Energy would be in a position to accept high-level nuclear waste, that a period of characterization and study would ultimately send three sites to the President of the United States and the President would select one of those sites.

I think it is important to mention at the outset that even in 1982 a number of Department of Energy experts were

uncomfortable, indeed, some were skeptical, that the 1998 deadline could be met, but they were overruled by politicians and the Department of Energy and others.

My colleagues know from my previous statements in the Chamber that this process, whatever its original intent may have been, was politicized immediately. Within the first few weeks after the legislation was enacted, States such as my own, and at that time the State that the distinguished occupant of the Chair represents, the State of Washington, the State of Texas, and others, were denied oversight funds as contemplated in the act and litigation was commenced to gather those funds.

That was an ominous beginning of what later turned out to be an entirely political nonscientific process. The original law contemplated that the entire country would be examined and that, indeed, various types of geological formations would be considered for high-level nuclear waste, and as I have indicated previously that three sites would be chosen and the President of the United States would then make a final determination.

None of that was to be. Shortly after the legislation was enacted, in the following year during the Presidential campaign one region of the country was assured it would not be considered for high-level nuclear waste. An internal memorandum within the Department of Energy indicated that another region would be excluded because of political opposition, and then the ultimate indignity came in 1987 with a piece of legislation that Nevadans will forever regard as the "screw Nevada" bill which completely altered the thrust of the process and said, look, we will choose one State, one site, and that will be the place that we will concentrate our efforts.

That site was at Yucca Mountain. The utilities are now contending that because no site would be available in 1998 to accept all of the high-level nuclear waste, indeed, a crisis atmosphere exists, that there is a call for action and they have proposed an ill-conceived piece of legislation that is S. 104 in our Chamber and H.R. 1270 in the other Chamber.

Let me emphasize that this is not a proposal favored by the scientific community through the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, a board established by act of Congress; it is not supported by the Department of Energy. It is the brainchild of the Nuclear Energy Institute, the overarching trade association that purports to advance the interests of nuclear utilities in America.

There is no science involved in this legislation. The utilities argue speciously that because the nuclear waste will not be available for shipment to a repository, indeed, there will be an enormous cost incurred by the Federal Government, that damage claims will approximate as much as \$80 billion.

This is totally specious, a fictitious number that is spun out of whole cloth. But the solution that has been advanced is much more disturbing and that is S. 104-H.R. 1270. This is a piece of legislation that would emasculate most of the environmental laws that have enjoyed bipartisan support for a quarter of a century, all in the interest of advancing the nuclear utilities' argument. It would create a temporary nuclear waste dump at the Nevada test site, a separate geographical location from Yucca Mountain which is where the permanent storage facility is currently being characterized.

Now, make no mistake that if H.R. 1270 and S. 104 were enacted tomorrow, under no conceivable scenario could any shipments occur in this year or, indeed, for some years into the future.

This interim storage proposal is not only a direct threat to the environmental legislation in this country. It would establish a health and safety standard for us in Nevada with respect to the level of radioactive emissions measured in millirems that would be 25 times the level allowed for safe drinking water. That standard is 4 millirems. By statute this legislation would propose that the acceptable standard for Nevadans, where this waste would be shipped, would be 25 times that level or 100 millirems. No conceivable argument in terms of sound public policy or science would justify such a legislative mandate.

For those who feel, as I do, that progress is being made in balancing the budget, with the possibility of a budget surplus for the first time in nearly three decades, the utilities have crafted a very clever bailout provision. Under the terms of the 1982 act, for each kilowatt of nuclear power generated, there is a mill tax levied. That mill tax goes into a nuclear waste fund, and out of that fund would be the expenses of maintaining a high-level nuclear waste repository, an obligation which would go far beyond the current life expectancy of any currently operating utilities.

Actuarial experts tell us that even under current law that fund is underfunded. That is to say that eventually the taxpayers are going to have to bail that fund out. At no time did the Nuclear Waste Trust Fund financial formula contemplate that it would also pay for a so-called temporary dump, the one that is contemplated in S. 104 and H.R. 1270, so an additional financial burden would be added.

The utilities are not content, however, with destroying that part of the financial basis for the legislation. They would impose a cap or a limitation on the amount of money that could be paid into that fund that would approximate the amount of money spent the previous year from the nuclear waste fund for purposes of this act. Remember that currently that fund, the nuclear waste fund, is underfunded actuarially. They would further limit the amount that goes into the fund, an

amount which is going to be necessary for decades ahead, well beyond the life of any nuclear utility. So, by adding the expense of a temporary waste dump, putting a cap on the amount of the fees that are paid into that fund, they guarantee that the American taxpayers will have to come up with tens, perhaps hundreds of millions of dollars from general taxpayer revenue in the outyears. That is simply financially irresponsible. Whatever one thinks of nuclear waste policy, we all ought to be able to agree that we ought not to build into legislation a financial time bomb which would begin ticking upon the enactment of this piece of legislation. This is a utility bailout provision and is bad policy.

The nuclear utilities have litigated this issue. In November 1987 they argue that the Department of Energy must, under the 1982 act, accept immediately delivery of the high-level nuclear waste. That was rejected by the Court. As I have indicated, the Court in deciding the case indicates that there is an appropriate remedy. I think all of us would fairly recognize that the utilities will incur some additional expense as a result of any additional storage capacity that they need to construct on site. So it is conceded by all that the utilities would be entitled to an offset; that is, a reduction in the amount of the mill tax levy paid into the nuclear waste trust fund. Indeed, Secretary Peña has initiated discussion along those lines. But the utilities have rejected that. They have rejected that because that's not what they want. They don't want fairness or an offset. What they want is a bailout, the provisions contained in this legislation, which shift the burden from the utilities to the American taxpayers in staggering amounts in the outyears.

As I have indicated, the Department of Energy does not favor this legislation to establish a temporary waste dump at the Nevada test site. The Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board created by this Congress, comprised of scientists—parenthetically, none of them from my home State—reject the necessity for this action. We would, in effect, be transporting 77,000 tons of high-level nuclear waste to Nevada. That doesn't just get there miraculously. It would pass through 43 States. Fifty million people live within a mile or less of the highway and rail shipment corridors—some of the largest cities in America. Accidents do happen. The potential could be catastrophic. We cannot be unmindful of the fact that in America today we face the threat of terrorist activity. Such was the tragedy of the World Trade Center in New York City, and we have seen other evidences of terrorist activity in our country. What an inviting target, 77,000 tons of high-level nuclear waste being transported across the highways and rail corridors of America.

Finally, the kind of storage that is contemplated at the Nevada test site in this so-called "temporary" facility is

known as dry cask storage. That storage is currently available and in use in a number of the utilities in America today, on site, approved by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission with a storage life of 100 years. So, if it is safe for Nevada, why would it not be safe to leave it at its current location—that technology has been approved—and to leave it there until such time as the ultimate issue is resolved of how to deal with this most dangerous and toxic substance known to mankind?

For those who have followed this debate for a number of years, it will come as no surprise that the utilities again have raised this crisis potential or scenario. Two decades ago, before this Senator came to the Chamber, the nuclear power industry was seeking, once again, to try to get the Congress to enact legislation to remove the high-level waste from the reactor sites. That program was then known as the AFR program, away-from-reactor site. If one looks at the arguments in the 1980s in which it was forecast that there would be a brownout, there would be a shortage of electricity in America, that all kinds of catastrophic things would happen to our economy—that was predicted by the mid-1980s if this legislation that was being proposed in the early eighties was not enacted. None of that far-fetched scenario came to be fact. In fact, no utility has suffered a brownout or a failure because of the absence of storage capacity. Many reactors have gone off line because they are no longer safe and others because they are not economically viable. That continues to be the case as recently as earlier this month with the reactor that is intended to be closed within the State of Illinois.

So, there is storage capacity available on site through dry cask storage that avoids the necessity of moving 77,000 metric tons across the highways and rail systems of America, through 43 States, with all of the potential for risk and accident that is inherent in that kind of volume. There is no need to take action. That is the view of the scientific community. That is the view of the Department of Energy. And that is the view of the President, who has indicated, should this legislation reach his desk, he will veto it because it makes no sense in terms of policy.

This is all about nuclear politics, not about nuclear energy policy. I urge my colleagues to be very careful when they listen to some of the advertisements that are currently airing on the radio and in the newspaper. The reality is that there is no crisis. We have been to this play before; same arguments, same results. Not necessary. Bad policy. And we should reject S. 104, H.R. 1270.

I again express my appreciation to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia for his courtesy and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

RENAMING WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT "RONALD REAGAN NATIONAL AIRPORT"

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I wanted to update my colleagues on this issue of the cost of the renaming of Washington National Airport. C-SPAN viewership is up today because our phones have been ringing quite a bit, both in my office and Senator COVERDELL's office and others. This is a fax that I received just an hour or so ago. It says:

Dear Senator, I'm watching today's coverage of the Senate on C-SPAN. I note an objection to renaming Washington National Airport the Ronald Reagan National Airport was the \$60,000 cost of new signs. In the way that I honor President Reagan and you, I humbly offer the \$60,000 cost of these signs.

I will repeat that, Mr. President.

I honor President Reagan. . . . I humbly offer the \$60,000 cost of these signs. Having lived in Alexandria for 5 years, I know that the Washington airport has always been considered the Washington, DC, National Airport, and any argument otherwise is simply partisan and specious. I support you and Senator COVERDELL in your effort to honor President Reagan on his birthday, which sadly could be his last.

Mr. President, I am not, obviously, going to give the name of the individual because of privacy considerations. But we are receiving call after call.

Let's not, as we go through these arguments one by one concerning the airport, let's be sure that the cost of renaming the signs—I find it interesting. They just went through a \$1-point-some billion remodeling without a single additional flight going in or out of the airport, yet the question is raised about a \$60,000 renaming.

Second, I want to point out again, it in no way affects the founder of our country, the father of our country, George Washington. I know Senator COVERDELL and I—Senator COVERDELL obviously speaks for himself, but I know of no objection if it was Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport. I'm sure we could work out that difficulty.

I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. In the original legislation it's the Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport. The House removed the "Washington"—Ronald Reagan National Airport. My amendment was simply in conjunction with that. Yes, just to make it absolutely clear, the original concept of the sponsor was that it was the Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport. If that needed any further clarification, I wanted to add it.

Mr. MCCAIN. Let me just finally say I am sorry this controversy has erupted. I hope we can work it out. I hope we can work it out within the next 24 hours amongst all of our colleagues in the Senate. I would like to move forward with it. As I said earlier, I regret we are starting out this year, the first real day of our session, in this kind of a difference of view.

Let me just make one additional point. I cannot speak for the Members

on this side of the aisle, but I understand the reverence that many Americans—not just Democrats but also Republicans—have for Robert Kennedy and Jack Kennedy and the entire Kennedy family. If there is some proposal to name the Justice Department building after Robert Kennedy, I would strongly support such an effort. And I would support such a thing in any way. Obviously, he was a former Attorney General of the United States.

But let's not set up these straw men to kind of, certainly not poison the atmosphere here, but it's not a good way for us to begin. I know everyone knows how those of us who knew Ronald Reagan, and the vast majority of Americans, feel about him. So I hope we can get this thing resolved. Again, I thank Senator COVERDELL, who served under President Reagan and knew him as well as anyone and whose idea this was for this very appropriate action. I just hope Senator COVERDELL will be able to make a phone call out to California very soon, at the time of President Reagan's birthday, and inform both President Reagan and Mrs. Reagan that we are honoring him in this very small way. There really is no way we can ever fully honor him for what he has done for the Nation and the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arizona for returning to the floor, for reading this very emotional letter. You know, in a sense the remarks that we have heard here this afternoon all have this common thread of admiration running through them, such as is expressed in this letter, almost as if there is—just during that period of time there was a connection between this man and his call for optimism, his belief in the country. And it evokes these kinds of emotions that were just expressed to us by Senator MCCAIN.

I appreciate the Senator's, in a sense, admonition that if there is some common ground here, that would be useful to pursue. At this point, in my view, a statement like this about a figure such as President Reagan stands on its own. That takes nothing away from anyone else or other heroes and heroines. But, if the other side has a goal or something of this nature, I am sure they would find many Republicans who would join with them in honoring that person. We have.

I mention my good friend and colleague from my own State for whom we have named a very prominent new courthouse. I mentioned the Roosevelt Memorial and others. This has not been, as Senator MCCAIN indicated, a very good way to begin this session of the Congress.

He has mentioned cost. He has mentioned this article that we are renaming an airport that was named for George Washington. That is not the case. These are roadblocks, and they